

## REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the attention accorded to the instant application, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the application as amended.

Claims 1, 3-6 and 9-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 7 and 8 have been canceled. Claims 1, 15 and 20 have been amended to remove the recitation of forming a sealed cavity between the optical panel and one face of a light control device. In addition, Claims 1, 15 and 20 have been amended to recite the bracket having a light shield wider than the aperture and arranged to cover the aperture such that the edge portion of the light shield overlaps with the chassis when the bracket is positioned for installation of the light emitting structure in the bay. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the application, such as in originally filed Claims 7 and 8, page 10 lines 11-20 and Figures 1, 2, 5 and 6. No new matter has been added to the disclosure by way of these amendments.

Claims 1, 3-6, 9 and 11-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement by containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time of the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 11-15 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,095,457 to Chou (hereinafter, "Chou") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,266,123 to Maejima et al. (hereinafter, "Maejima").

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chou in view of Maejima and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,445,373 to Yamamoto (hereinafter, "Yamamoto").

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chou in view of Maejima and Yamamoto and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,545,732 to Nakano (hereinafter, "Nakano").

Claims 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chou in view Maejima and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,150,557 to Chen et al. (hereinafter, "Chen").

In view of the following remarks, Applicants request further examination and reconsideration of the present patent application.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 1, 3-6, 9 and 11-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement by containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time of the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claim recitation of forming a sealed cavity between the optical panel and one face of a light control device has been removed from Claim 1, 15 and 20, leaving the objection to these claims and all claims depending therefrom of the present application moot. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of Claims 1, 3-6, 9 and 11-20 is earnestly solicited.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-15 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chou in view of Maejima.

The light shield of the claimed invention prevents leakage of light through a clearance between the chassis and the bracket. The specification and the drawings show that the light

shield (212 of FIG. 2 of the present application) is wider than the aperture (168 of FIG. 2 of the present application) and is arranged to cover the aperture such that the edge portion of the light shield overlaps with the chassis (162 of FIG. 2 of the present application) when the bracket is positioned for installation of the light emitting structure in the bay

Chou teaches and suggests an LCD television with a detachable backlight module which can be removed. See Column 2 line 59 to Column 3 line 7 of Chou. The Official Action alleges that Chou teaches a light leak prevention feature (33 of FIG. 2 of Chou) including a light shield arranged to cover the aperture when the bracket is positioned for installation of the light emitting structure to the bay, as recited in originally filed Claims 7-8, now recited in amended Claims 1, 15, 20 and all claims depending therefrom of the present application. The cover (33 of FIG. 2 of Chou) as taught and suggested by Chou does not prevent leakage of light because the cover is fitted inside the aperture of the casing (10 of FIG. 2 of Chou) as seen in FIG. 2 and 3 of Chou. The cover of Chou does not prevent the leakage of light through a clearance between the casing and the cover and does not teach or suggest the light shield as recited in Claims 1, 15, 20 and all claims depending therefrom of the present application.

Maejima teaches a liquid crystal display device which can be sealed to prevent dirt from entering between the liquid crystal display panel and the light guide plate. See Column 12 lines 37-43 of Maejima. Maejima does not teach a bracket for quick installation. Further, Maejima does not teach or suggest a bracket having a light shield wider than the aperture and arranged to cover the aperture such that the edge portion of the light shield overlaps with the chassis when the bracket is positioned for installation of the light emitting structure in the bay, as recited in Claims 1, 15, 20 and all claims depending therefrom of the present application.

Neither Chou nor Maejima teach or suggest a bracket having a light shield wider than the

aperture and arranged to cover the aperture such that the edge portion of the light shield overlaps with the chassis when the bracket is positioned for installation of the light emitting structure in the bay, as recited in Claims 1, 15, 20 and all claims depending therefrom of the present application. Therefore, the combination of Chou and Maejima does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Claims 7 and 8 are cancelled, rendering their rejection moot. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-15 and 18-20 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chou in view of Maejima and further in view of Yamamoto.

The deficiencies of Chou and Maejima are stated above, Yamamoto does not cure these deficiencies. The combination of Chou, Maejima and Yamamoto would not render the claimed invention obvious.

Yamamoto teaches a removable light source unit, which, after unscrewing can be removed, an optical panel which is secured to the frame and a LCD screen which is affixed to the front of the frame. See Column 6 lines 43-67 of Yamamoto. The combination of Chou, Maejima and Yamamoto does not teach or suggest a bracket having a light shield wider than the aperture and arranged to cover the aperture such that the edge portion of the light shield overlaps with the chassis when the bracket is positioned for installation of the light emitting structure in the bay, as recited in Claim 1, from which Claim 5 depends.

Neither Chou, Maejima nor Yamamoto teach or suggest a bracket having a light shield wider than the aperture and arranged to cover the aperture such that the edge portion of the light shield overlaps with the chassis when the bracket is positioned for installation of the light emitting structure in the bay. Therefore, the combination of Chou and Maejima does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Thus, the combination of Chou, Maejima and Yamamoto does

not render the claimed invention obvious. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of Claim 5 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chou in view of Maejima and Yamamoto and in further view of Nakano.

The deficiencies of Chou, Maejima and Yamamoto are stated above; Nakano does not cure these deficiencies. The combination of Chou, Maejima, Yamamoto and Nakano would not render the claimed invention obvious.

Nakano teaches the use of rubber separators to hold fluorescent lamps in an exact position away from a frame in the backlight assembly of a liquid crystal display. See Column 2 line 60 to Column 3 line 4 of Nakano. The combination of Chou, Maejima, Yamamoto and Nakano does not teach or suggest a bracket having a light shield wider than the aperture and arranged to cover the aperture such that the edge portion of the light shield overlaps with the chassis when the bracket is positioned for installation of the light emitting structure in the bay, as recited in Claim 1 of the present application, from which Claim 6 depends.

Neither Chou, Maejima, Yamamoto nor Nakano teach or suggest a bracket having a light shield wider than the aperture and arranged to cover the aperture such that the edge portion of the light shield overlaps with the chassis when the bracket is positioned for installation of the light emitting structure in the bay. Thus, the combination of Chou, Maejima, Yamamoto and Nakano does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Thus, the combination of Chou, Maejima, Yamamoto and Nakano does not render the claimed invention obvious. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of Claim 6 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chou in view Maejima and in further view of Chen.

The deficiencies of Chou and Maejima are stated above, Chen does not cure these deficiencies. The combination of Chou, Maejima and Chen would not render the claimed invention obvious.

Chen teaches a backlight module which houses fluorescent lamps between two optical panels, which are affixed to the frame of the backlight module. See Column 3 lines 12 to 38 of Chen. Upon removal of the backlight module, including the two optical panels, the inner face of the liquid crystal display will be exposed to the ambient air. The combination of Chou, Maejima and Chen does not teach or suggest a bracket having a light shield wider than the aperture and arranged to cover the aperture such that the edge portion of the light shield overlaps with the chassis when the bracket is positioned for installation of the light emitting structure in the bay, as recited in Claim 15 of the application, from which Claims 16 and 17 depend.

Neither Chou, Maejima nor Chen teach or suggest a bracket having a light shield wider than the aperture and arranged to cover the aperture such that the edge portion of the light shield overlaps with the chassis when the bracket is positioned for installation of the light emitting structure in the bay. Thus, the combination of Chou, Maejima and Chen does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of Claims 16 and 17 is earnestly solicited.

Applicants believe that the paper submitted herein provides a complete response to the Office Action, and the present case is in condition for allowance. Therefore, in view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all rejections, and

allowance of all pending claims in due course. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with the Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned, Applicants' attorney, at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Paul J. Esatto, Jr./  
Registration No. 30,749

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.  
400 Garden City Plaza - Ste. 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343  
PJE:KRV:DRB/vh:reg